



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D. C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
07/205,037	06/10/88	BEYERSDORF et al	C-34,972A

EXAMINER	
N Nutter	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
153	12

DATE MAILED:

EXAMINER INTERVIEW SUMMARY RECORD

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Lisha M. Simmonds (attorney) (3) William H. Kerkey (inventor)
(2) Robert S. Beyersdorf (inventor) (4) Nathan M. Nutter (examiner)

Date of interview 16 March 1989

Type: ☐ Telephonic ☒ Personal (copy is given to ☒ applicant ☒ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☒ Yes ☐ No. If yes, brief description: Two ceiling tile samples. (1) Prepared

with starch showed discoloration and sagging; (2) Prepared with latex (according
to the invention) showed no discoloration nor sagging. The latex sample also
Agreement ☒ was reached with respect to some or all of the claims in question. ☐ was not reached. exhibited greater integrity
upon handling.

Claims discussed: all claims

Identification of prior art discussed: Hen

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The Declarations of

John Caniza and William Kerkey were discussed to clarify the
importance of the T_g , modulus of rupture and sag resistance
as regards the instant invention. Further, Table I at page 13 was discussed
with regards to the Comparative examples of latex and starch. Applicants'
comments in view of the Declarations and Table I were deemed to be convincing of
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be
attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)
patentability.

Unless the paragraphs below have been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS
NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW (e.g., items 1-7 on the reverse side of this form). If a response to the
last Office action has already been filed, then applicant is given one month from this interview date to provide a statement of the substance of the interview.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

☒ Since the examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and
requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the
response requirements of the last Office action.

Nathan M Nutter
Examiner's Signature